

DAVID L. ANDERSON (CABN 149604)
 United States Attorney
 SARA WINSLOW (DCBN 457643)
 Chief, Civil Division
 CHRISTOPHER F. JEU (CABN 247865)
 Assistant United States Attorney
 150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900
 San Jose, California 95113
 Telephone: (408) 535-5082
 FAX: (408) 535-5066
 Christopher.Jeu@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendant
 Federal Bureau of Prisons

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 OAKLAND DIVISION

KEITH H. (“MALIK”) WASHINGTON, an
 individual; and SAN FRANCISCO BAY
 VIEW NATIONAL BLACK NEWSPAPER,
 a California corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS,
 THE GEO GROUP, INC., dba
 GEO CALIFORNIA, INC., MONICA HOOK,
 MARIA RICHARD, WILL GOMEZ,
 MURTALA LANVAL, AND DOES 1 through
 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:21-cv-00787-JST

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
 PLAINTIFFS’ APPLICATIONS FOR A
 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER,
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, OR AN ORDER
 TO SHOW CAUSE**

Hon. Jon S. Tigar
 Location: Courtroom 6 – 2nd Floor
 Date: March 10, 2021
 Time: 9:30 a.m.

1. Plaintiffs have not established likelihood of success on the merits. *See Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Defendants did not retaliate against Plaintiffs. Rather, Defendants were enforcing the Federal Bureau of Prisons and Geo Group rules and regulations on an even-handed basis.

2. Nor have Plaintiffs shown irreparable harm, balance of the equities, or public interest. *See id.*

1 3. Moreover, a mandatory injunction is not warranted. *See Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal.*, 13
2 F.3d 1313, 1319 (9th Cir. 1994). A mandatory injunction “goes well beyond simply maintaining the
3 status quo pendente lite and is particularly disfavored.” *Id.* at 1320. A mandatory injunction “should
4 not be issued unless the facts and law clearly favor the moving party.” *Anderson v. United States*, 612
5 F.2d 1112, 1114 (9th Cir. 1979). Mandatory injunctions “are not granted unless extreme or very serious
6 damage will result and are not issued in doubtful cases[.]” *Id.* at 1115. Here, Plaintiffs have not
7 established that the facts and law clearly favor them.

8 4. Plaintiffs’ Motion for Temporary Restraining Order is denied.

9 5. Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Preliminary Injunction is denied.

10 6. Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Order to Show Cause is denied.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: _____

HON. JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge